

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

April 26, 1999 LB 271

property taxes are they reducing and whose advantage is being gained? At that point you have government going out and operating businesses and enterprises, looking like a private individual but not subject to the same tests. That isn't, clearly, what the voters had in mind when they adopted the amendment. They recognized that government, when it looks like a private person, ought to be treated like a private person. Senator Tyson would simply take that away with a few words. The other thing that Senator Tyson doesn't seem to recognize is that an exemption in one place is higher taxes someplace else. And that's also part of what the issue is about because, remember, taxes have to be paid no matter what. Taxes have to be paid no matter what, because there's still governmental entities out there that are out there that aren't operated because they have lots of property that's available to them and they generate revenues from that property and use those to operate. But there's a third issue here and it's not one that we've discussed before. What about accountability? What do you think the budgets look like for entities that would be supported exclusively by enterprises? Does anybody care what they're doing? Is there any scrutiny about...of their expenditures? Does anybody examine them to see if they're being used efficiently? Does anybody examine them to see if they're carrying out the real public purposes that the dollars are intended to, or do we let them just stay off there and get as fat and happy as they want, and we just ignore them because it isn't tax dollars? But it was tax dollars because they were subsidized by an exception and we just never bothered to take a look at them. Senator Tyson's amendment literally guts the provisions and would allow any governmental subdivision to own any property, to lease it out, to gain monies from that operation and always say that is necessary to carry out my public purpose. Simply guts the bill. And I guess if you want to do that, you can but I don't think that's what the voters of the state wanted us to do when they adopted the amendment. There was a...there was a question earlier about whether anybody had notice that this was coming. The constitutional amendment that was adopted in November was originally introduced as LR 45CA, pended before this Legislature for a full year and then was adopted, put on the ballot. Anybody that didn't see that there was going to be some potential for something to happen in this arena hasn't been watching, hasn't been listening, hasn't seen the same concerns,